Case 1:21-cr-00036-ELH Document 446. Filed 04/26/24 Page 1 of 4

United States Attorney District of Maryland

Jefferson M. Gray Assistant United States Attorney & Deputy Appellate Chief Jefferson.M.Gray@usdoj.gov Suite 400 36 S. Charles Street Baltimore, MD 21201-3119 DIRECT: 410-209-4915 MAIN: 410-209-4800 FAX: 410-962-3091

April 27, 2024

BY CM/ECF

The Hon. Ellen L. Hollander U.S. District Court Judge U.S. Courthouse 101 W. Lombard Street Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Re:

United States v. Jacky McComber

Crim. No. ELH-21-036

Dear Judge Hollander:

I am writing in response to the Court's request that I identify the page cites for the quotation from the transcript of the sentencing hearing in *United States v. Atif Malik*, Crim. No. JKB-16-0324, which appeared at page 35 of ECF # 431, our supplemental sentencing memo. That quotation came from pages 118-119 of that transcript. I apologize for the oversight, and will attach copies of the relevant pages.

Very Truly Yours,

Jefferson M. Gray

cc: All counsel (by ECF)

г	
1 2	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
4) Plaintiff,
5	vs.) CRIMINAL NO.: ATIF BABAR MALIK,) 1:16-cr-00324-JKB
6	Defendant.
7)))
8	
9	SENTENCING BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES K. BREDAR
11	September 11, 2018 Baltimore, Maryland
12	Daretmore, naryrana
13	For the Plaintiff:
14 15	Jefferson M. Gray, Esquire Sean R. Delaney, Esquire <i>Assistant U.S. Attorneys</i>
16	For the Defendant:
17	Michael E. Lawlor, Esquire
18	William C. Brennan, Jr., Esquire Nicholas G. Madiou, Esquire
19	Brennan, McKenna & Lawlor
20	
21	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by computer.
22	
23	Patricia G. Mitchell, RMR, CRR Federal Official Court Reporter
25	101 W. Lombard Street, 4th Floor Baltimore, Maryland 21201

charge. The defendant is convicted of multiple acts of violating the statute prohibiting kickbacks as applied in his area of work, his profession. He's convicted of offenses in relation to the health care system and how it is funded and the government's participation in that funding. He's convicted of fraud in that context. He's been convicted of effectively stealing from the people of the United States by virtue of not paying his fair share of the income tax that everyone owes.

The third factor for the Court to take into account is the seriousness of the offense, the need to promote respect for the law, and the need to provide just punishment. Crimes themselves are all serious in their own right but this matter, this factor I take to invite the Court to reflect on exactly how the offenses were committed and what the defendant's overall scheming was relative to other versions of this offense as it is committed, unfortunately, on a somewhat regular basis in our society. How else does one gauge seriousness of the offense? The crimes themselves, of course, are all serious, but are there circumstances present here that suggest that these were even more serious than normal? The Court's conclusion is that there are some circumstances here that are very troubling in that regard.

Early in the sentencing hearing, the Court focused attention on this civil lawsuit that was filed that named

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ms. Decker and others. The Court is troubled by its conclusion that this is an example of a party employing the civil justice system for some purpose very different from that which it was designed for, and that is that the defendant is involved in the prosecution of this lawsuit at the same time that he's fully aware of his own deep involvement in serious fraudulent misconduct. What in God's name was going on with the effort to file suit himself in these circumstances? left with the conclusion that he was going to use, he was going to weaponize the civil justice system to his benefit, that that was the objective. That's a grievous escalation of misconduct designed to protect and cover tracks and throw authorities off the trail, and most significantly, dissuade witnesses from telling what they know and reporting misconduct that has occurred in their presence.

Other circumstances that are troubling, the abuse of trust that is implicit whenever a medical doctor starts making decisions about patient care and treatment and referrals and the obtaining of lab data and so forth based on factors other than what is in the best interest of the patient.

Unquestionably that happened here. When these kickbacks are being paid and negotiated and obtained to the extent that they were here, the financial interest has come to predominate as opposed to the medical interest of the patient, that's a serious aggravator.